Locality and topology in the molecular Aharonov-Bohm effect

Erik Sjöqvist*
Department of Quantum Chemistry, Uppsala University, Box 518, Se-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden

It is shown that the molecular Aharonov-Bohm effect is neither nonlocal nor topological in the sense of the standard magnetic Aharonov-Bohm effect. It is further argued that there is a close relationship between the molecular Aharonov-Bohm effect and the Aharonov-Casher effect for an electrically neutral spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ particle encircling a line of charge.

PACS numbers: PACS number(s): 03.65.Vf, 31.30.Gs

arXiv:quant-ph/0112136v2 5 Nov 2002

In the standard magnetic Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect [1], a charged particle exhibits a testable phase shift when encircling a line of magnetic flux. The AB effect is nonlocal as it may happen although the particle experiences no physical field and no exchange of physical quantity takes place along the particle's path [2]. It is topological as it requires the particle to be confined to a multiply connected region and as any assignment of phase shift along the particle's path is necessarily gauge dependent and thus neither objective nor experimentally testable [2].

In the molecular Aharonov-Bohm (MAB) effect [3], the nuclear motion exhibits a measurable effect under adiabatic transport around a conical intersection. A condition for this effect to occur is the accumulation along the nuclear path of a nontrivial Berry phase [4] acquired by the corresponding electronic motion. This additional requirement makes MAB special and its physical nature potentially different from that of the standard AB effect.

To delineate this difference is the major aim of this Letter. We demonstrate that although MAB requires the nuclear motion to be confined to a multiply connected region, it fails to obey the remaining criteria for a nonlocal and topological effect. Thus, it follows from our analysis that MAB should neither be regarded as topological nor as nonlocal in the sense of the standard AB effect. Instead, MAB displays an adiabatically averaged autocorrelation among the electronic variables, which in the two-level case resembles that of the local torque on a spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ moving in a locally gauge invariant electric field. Furthermore, it is possible to relate the MAB effect to the noncyclic Berry phase [5] acquired by the electronic variables, which is a locally gauge invariant quantity that could be tested in polarimetry [5] or in interferometry [6]. It should be noted that an argumentation similar to that of this Letter has been put forward in the context of force free electromagnetic effects in neutron interferometry [2].

We consider the well studied $E\otimes\epsilon$ Jahn-Teller model, in which the symmetry induced degeneracy of two electronic states is lifted by their interaction with a doubly degenerate vibrational mode. In the diabatic approximation [7], this is described by the vibronic Hamiltonian [8]

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2}p_r^2+\frac{1}{2r^2}p_\theta^2+\frac{1}{2}r^2 \\ &\quad +kr^{2|\xi|}\Big[\cos(2\xi\theta)\sigma_x+\sin(2\xi\theta)\sigma_y\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where (r,θ) are polar coordinates of the vibrational mode, (p_r,p_θ) the corresponding canonical momenta, k is the vibronic coupling strength, $\xi=\frac{1}{2},-1,...$ describes the order of the effect [9], and we have neglected spin-orbit coupling. The linear $E\otimes\epsilon$ model is characterized by $\xi=\frac{1}{2}$, while in the quadratic model we have $\xi=-1$. The electronic degrees of freedom are described by Pauli operators defined in terms of the diabatic electronic states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ as $\sigma_x=|0\rangle\langle 1|+|1\rangle\langle 0|$, $\sigma_y=-i|0\rangle\langle 1|+i|1\rangle\langle 0|$, and $\sigma_z=|0\rangle\langle 0|-|1\rangle\langle 1|$. The electronic potential energies associated with H are $E_\pm(r)=\frac{1}{2}r^2\pm kr+1/(8r^2)$, which, by omitting the divergent Born-Huang term $1/(8r^2)$, conically intersect at the origin $r=0$.

The Born-Oppenheimer regime is attained when the electronic potential energies $E_\pm$ are well separated. Explicitly one may take this to mean that E_+-E_- is large at the minimum of E_-. For large separation the Born-Huang term $1/(8r^2)$ is negligible so that E_- has its minimum approximately at $r=k$ yielding the Born-Oppenheimer condition $2k^2\gg 1$. In this regime the nuclear motion may take place on one of the electronic potential energy surfaces, accompanied by an additional effective vector potential.

Similarly, adiabatic motion of the electronic variables occurs when [10] $|\langle -|\dot{H}_e|+\rangle|\ll(E_+-E_-)^2$, when treating the nuclear degrees of freedom as time-dependent variables. Here, the operator $H_e=kr^{2|\xi|}[\cos(2\xi\theta)\sigma_x+\sin(2\xi\theta)\sigma_y]$ is the electronic Hamiltonian with instantaneous eigenstates $|\pm\rangle$ corresponding to the electronic potential energies $E_\pm$, and we have put $\hbar=1$. At the minimum of E_- the adiabaticity condition becomes $\xi|\dot{\theta}|\ll 2k^2$, where we again have neglected the Born-Huang term $1/(8r^2)$.

In the Born-Oppenheimer regime consider the nuclear motion on the lowest electronic potential energy surface,

*Electronic address: erik.sjoqvist@kvac.uu.se

as described by the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_- = \langle -|H|-\rangle = \frac{1}{2}p_r^2 + \frac{1}{2r^2}\Big[p_\theta + \xi\Big]^2 + E_-(r) \qquad (2)$$

with $|-\rangle$ single-valued around the conical intersection at the origin. Here, $\xi \mathbf{e}_\theta/r$ is the MAB vector potential that could be absorbed into the phase factor

$$\exp\Big[i\int_{\mathbf{r}_0}^{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\xi}{r'}\mathbf{e}'_\theta \cdot d\mathbf{r}'\Big] = \exp\Big[i\xi(\theta-\theta_0)\Big], \qquad (3)$$

which for the linear case $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to a nontrivial sign change for a closed loop only if it encircles the conical intersection. This sign change has measurable consequences as it restores the original molecular symmetry of the vibronic ground state [11] and as it shifts the spectrum of the quantized nuclear pseudorotation [12]. On the other hand, in the quadratic case $\xi = -1$, the phase factor in Eq. (3) for a closed loop around the conical intersection is $+1$ and the MAB vector potential does not have any observable consequences on the nuclear motion.

The electronic Born-Oppenheimer states are eigenstates of $\sigma_x(\theta) \equiv \cos(2\xi\theta)\sigma_x + \sin(2\xi\theta)\sigma_y$. It is therefore perhaps tempting to replace the electronic motion by the appropriate eigenvalue of $\sigma_x(\theta)$ in the Born-Oppenheimer regime so that the electronic variables can be ignored, creating an illusion that the nontrivial effect of the MAB vector potential on the nuclear motion in the $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$ case is nonlocal and topological in the sense of the standard AB effect. However, the electronic variables are dynamical and do not commute among themselves. In particular, although the expectation values of the remaining mutually complementary electronic observables $\sigma_y(\theta) \equiv -\sin(2\xi\theta)\sigma_x + \cos(2\xi\theta)\sigma_y$ and $\sigma_z(\theta) \equiv \sigma_z$ vanish in the Born-Oppenheimer limit, their fluctuations do not. As the molecule is ideally a closed physical system, its total energy is conserved so that equal and opposite fluctuations must be exchanged locally with the internal electromagnetic field of the molecule during the nuclear pseudorotation.

To take the argumentation against the nonlocal and topological nature of MAB a step further, let us consider the vibronic motion in the adiabatic picture. First, we note that the motion of $\theta(t)$ depends among other things on the motion of the electronic variables. Thus, to distinguish the vibronic coupling effect from that associated with the dynamics of the nuclei, it turns out to be useful to transform the electronic variables to an internal molecular frame that co-moves with the pseudorotation. In this frame the vibronic Hamiltonian reads

$$H' = U^\dagger H U = \frac{1}{2k^2}\big[p_\theta - \xi\sigma_z\big]^2 + \frac{k^2}{2} + k^2\sigma_x, \qquad (4)$$

where $U = \exp[-i\xi\theta\sigma_z]$ is the unitary spin rotation operator and we have put $r = k$. Using H' and the Heisenberg picture we obtain the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} k^2\dot{\theta} &= p_\theta - \xi\sigma_z, \\ \dot{p}_\theta &= 0, \\ \dot{\sigma}_x &= 2\xi\dot{\theta}\sigma_y, \\ \dot{\sigma}_y &= -2\xi\dot{\theta}\sigma_x - 2k^2\sigma_z, \\ \dot{\sigma}_z &= 2k^2\sigma_y, \end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

where $\xi|\dot{\theta}| \ll 2k^2$ in the adiabatic limit. It follows that the electronic part describes the local torque due to an effective magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = (2k^2, 0, -2\xi\dot{\theta})$ seen by the electronic variables in the rotating frame. The large static x component of $\mathbf{B}$ depends only on the vibronic coupling parameter k and is irrelevant to MAB. On the other hand, the small z component corresponds exactly to the MAB effect and gives rise to a $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot(\mathbf{v}\times\mathbf{E})$ interaction effect on the spin in its rest frame when it moves in the $r-\theta$ plane exposed to the effective electric field $\mathbf{E} = (\xi/r)\mathbf{e}_r$. This effective $\mathbf{E}$ field coincides with that of a charged line in the z direction sitting at the conical intersection and with ξ being proportional to the charge per unit length. Thus, the term responsible for MAB resembles exactly that of the Aharonov-Casher (AC) effect [13] for an electrically neutral spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ particle encircling a line of charge.

Interpreting the phase shift in Eq. (3) as an AC effect suggests that MAB is essentially neither nonlocal nor topological as it depends on an integral whose integrand is proportional to the locally gauge invariant effective $\mathbf{E}$ field and does not depend on any physical quantity outside the nuclear path. As has been demonstrated in Ref. [2] in the context of force free electromagnetic effects for neutrons, the local nature of MAB may be further elucidated by considering the relative change of the initial and instantaneous electronic variables being represented by the vector operators $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$, respectively. The starting point for such a semiclassical analysis is to consider in the rotating frame the electronic autocorrelation operators

$$\begin{aligned} C(t) &= \frac{1}{4}\Big[\sigma_x(0)\sigma_x(t) + \sigma_y(0)\sigma_y(t) + \text{h.c.}\Big], \\ S(t) &= \frac{1}{4}\Big[\sigma_x(0)\sigma_y(t) - \sigma_y(0)\sigma_x(t) + \text{h.c.}\Big] \end{aligned} \qquad (6)$$

that measure the correlation between the $x-y$ projections of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$. These operators are Hermitian and thus measurable in principle. Their equations of motion read

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{C} &= 2\xi\dot{\theta}\ S - \xi\dot{\theta}\sin(2k^2t), \\ \dot{S} &= -2\xi\dot{\theta}\ C + \xi\dot{\theta}\Big[1 - \cos(2k^2t)\Big], \end{aligned} \qquad (7)$$

where we have used Eq. (5). These equations are characterized by two time scales: the fast electronic oscillations and the slow nuclear pseudorotation, with frequencies $2k^2$ and $2\xi\dot{\theta}$, respectively. Thus, we may simplify

Eq. (7) by adiabatic averaging [14] over one period of the fast motion yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\overline{C}} &= 2\xi\dot{\theta}\,\overline{S}, \\ \dot{\overline{S}} &= -2\xi\dot{\theta}\,\overline{C} + \xi\dot{\theta}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

which have the solutions

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{C} &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 + \cos[2\xi(\theta-\theta_0)]\Big), \\ \overline{S} &= -\frac{1}{2}\sin[2\xi(\theta-\theta_0)]. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This shows that the relative angle $\varphi = 2\xi(\theta-\theta_0)$ between the two $x-y$ projections of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$ is changed by the action of the local torque. φ is precisely twice the MAB phase in Eq. (3), where the factor 2 is the usual rotation factor for spin$-\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, MAB may be described in terms of the relative angle between the $x-y$ projections of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$. The change of this angle is due to the torque on the electronic variables and shows that MAB is essentially a local effect.

There is an objective way to relate the phase shift in Eq. (3) locally along the nuclear path using the noncyclic Berry phase γ_g of the (lowest) electronic Born-Oppenheimer state vector

$$|-(\theta)\rangle = \frac{e^{i\alpha(\theta)}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[e^{-i\xi\theta}|0\rangle + e^{i\xi\theta}|1\rangle\Big]. \tag{10}$$

Here, we assume α to be differentiable along the path but otherwise arbitrary. The noncyclic Berry phase is defined by removing the accumulation of local phase changes from the total phase and is testable in polarimetry [5] or in interferometry [6]. We obtain for $|-(\theta)\rangle$ [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_g &= \arg\langle -(\theta_0)|-(\theta)\rangle + i\int_{\theta_0}^{\theta}\langle -(\theta')|\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta'}|-(\theta')\rangle d\theta' \\ &= \arg\cos[\xi(\theta-\theta_0)]. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Clearly, γ_g is locally gauge invariant as it is independent of α. It corresponds to a phase jump of π at $\theta-\theta_0 = \pi/(2\xi)$, where the overlap $\langle -(\theta_0)|-(\theta)\rangle$ vanishes. In the quadratic $E\times\epsilon$ Jahn-Teller case where $\xi = -1$, a closed loop around the conical intersection contains two π phase jumps, thus explaining the $+1$ MAB phase factor. On the other hand, in the linear case where $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$, there is only a single π jump creating a physically nontrivial sign change for such a loop. Thus, both the absence in the quadratic case and the presence in the linear case of a nontrivial MAB effect could be explained locally as they both require the existence of points along the nuclear path where the electronic states at θ_0 and θ become orthogonal. This local assignment of electronic phase shift is gauge invariant at each point along the nuclear path and thus experimentally testable in principle. It shows that MAB is essentially not a topological effect.

In conclusion, we have shown in the case of the $E\otimes\epsilon$ Jahn-Teller model that the molecular Aharonov-Bohm (MAB) effect is neither nonlocal nor topological in the sense of the standard magnetic Aharonov-Bohm effect. Locality is preserved as MAB can be explained as a local torque on the electronic variables that accumulates along the path of the nuclei around the conical intersection. It is not topological as it may be described in terms of a gauge invariant effective electric field and as there is an objective way to relate the phase shift locally along the nuclear path via the noncyclic Berry phase. We remark that the present analysis also applies to other molecular systems that exhibit conical intersections, as well as to the microwave resonator experiments recently discussed in the literature [15].

This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council.

[1] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **115**, 485 (1959).

[2] M. Peshkin and H.J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2847 (1995).

[3] C.A. Mead and D.G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **70**, 2284 (1979); C.A. Mead, Chem. Phys. **49**, 23 (1980); *Ibid.* **49**, 33 (1980).

[4] M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **392**, 45 (1984).

[5] G. García de Polavieja and E. Sjöqvist, Am. J. Phys. **66**, 431 (1998).

[6] A.G. Wagh, V.C. Rakhecha, P. Fischer, and A. Ioffe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1992 (1998); E. Sjöqvist, Phys. Lett. A **286**, 4 (2001).

[7] C.A. Mead and D.G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **77**, 6090 (1982).

[8] J.W. Zwanziger and E.R. Grant, J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 2954 (1987).

[9] For simplicity, it is assumed in Eq. (1) that no mixing of different orders ξ occurs. Such a mixing introduces new conical intersections, as has been shown in Ref. [8], and also changes the electronic potential energy surfaces, but the present argumentation against the nonlocal and topological nature of MAB would still be valid.

[10] L.I. Schiff, Quantum mechanics (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955), 2nd ed., pp. 213-216.

[11] F.S. Ham, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 725 (1987).

[12] B. Kendrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2431 (1997); H. von Busch, V. Dev, H.-A. Eckel, S. Kasahara, J. Wang, W. Demtröder, P. Sebald, and W. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4584 (1998).

[13] Y. Aharonov and A. Casher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 319 (1984).

[14] V.I. Arnold, Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics, 2nd Ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989), ch. 10.

[15] H.-M. Lauber, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1004 (1994); D.E. Manolopoulos and M.S. Child, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2223 (1999); F. Pistolesi and N. Manini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1585 (2000); J. Samuel and A. Dhar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 260401 (2001).